Christian Education

Vol. XII MAY, 1929 No. 8

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

Kenneth Scott Latourette
Luther Allan Weigle
Edmund D. Soper
John L. Seaton

The Council of Church Boards of Education

HEADQUARTERS

111 Fifth Avenue New York City

Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary

———— ————, University Secretary

Alfred Williams Anthony, Associate Secretary

OFFICERS FOR 1929

PRESIDENT—Dr. B. C. Davis

VICE-PRESIDENT—Dr. A. E. Kirk

RECORDING SECRETARY—Mr. Harry T. Stock

TREASURER—Bank of New York and Trust Company

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Drs. F. E. Stockwell, J. H. Bradford, Frank W. Padelford, Robert L. Kelly, *ex-officio.*

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Dr. Charles H. Judd, Director, The University of Chicago.
President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College.
Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City.
Mr. John Stites, Louisville Trust Company, Louisville.
Judge David F. Matchett, Illinois Appellate Court, Chicago.
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College.

STANDING COMMITTEES

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: John L. Seaton (three years), C. C. McCracken (two years), R. L. Kelly (one year).

COLLEGES: H. G. Pritchard, James E. Clarke, H. H. Sherman, S. K. Mosemman.

NORMAL SCHOOLS: Katherine C. Foster, Mary E. Markley.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE: M. Willard Lampe, George R. Baker, Frances P. Greenough, Katherine C. Foster, Mary E. Markley, W. F. Sheldon, H. T. Stock, C. P. Harry, J. M. Culbreth, C. Leslie Glenn, Jos. C. Todd, J. H. Powell.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: W. S. Bovard, W. A. Harper, H. H. Sweets.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ON RELIGION: M. Willard Lampe, John W. Suter, Jr.

Christian Education

Vol. XII MAY, 1929 No. 8

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Assistant to Editor

MARTHA T. BOARDMAN

Contributing Editors

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY

ISMAR J. PERITZ

HERBERT E. EVANS

GARDINER M. DAY

Published Monthly, Omitting July, August and September, at Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the United States of America
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

October, 1928, to June, 1929

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is $1.50 per annum; ten or more subscriptions $1.00 each; 25 cents for single copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Editorials

Applying the Acid Test 461

A New Appointment 463

The Christian College—A Definition and Program, *Kenneth Scott Latourette* 464

What Is a Christian College? *Luther Allan Weigle* 473

Academic Freedom in a Christian College, *Edmund D. Soper* 476

The Christian College Replies to Its Critics, *John L. Seaton* 482

The Seminary World, *Gardiner M. Day* 487

Episcopal Postulants at Lehigh University, *Arthur T. Reasoner* 490

The New Curriculum of Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, *R. L. Kelly* 491

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

Women as Officials in the Church, *Ismar J. Peritz* 495

An Experiment in Correlation and Organization of Courses at the College Level, *Charles M. Bond* 497

The College Department of Bible and Religious Education—Its Objectives and Methods, *George H. Fickes* 505

The Conference on Financial and Fiduciary Matters, 1929, *Alfred W. Anthony* 510

What Precedes This Conference? *A. W. Anthony* 514

"Bishop Brent," *O. D. Foster* 516

The Worker's Bookshelf 517

Here and There 520

Christian Education

Vol. XII MAY, 1929 No. 8

EDITORIAL

Applying the Acid Test

We present in this issue a sheaf of newly devised plans and specifications for the Christian College. Dr. Latourette covers the ground quite comprehensively; in the extract from Dean Weigle's address certain ideals and principles are set forth; President Soper expounds his administrative policy as regards academic freedom and comes directly to grips with some very practical considerations; President Seaton, out of years of experience as a college executive and administrator, offers some rebuttal testimony against certain loose and unwarranted criticism.

More and more the educational philosophers and workers are agreeing that the administration and faculty are chiefly responsible for the vitality and trends of the institution's spiritual life. If the president and faculty of a college really desire to have the college worthy of the name Christian, the purpose can be accomplished. The present writer during the years has held conversations on this subject individually and collectively with a multitude of college officials and teachers. He is convinced that many teachers in denominational colleges are day by day, within the classroom and without, no matter what subjects they are teaching, exerting a most wholesome influence in building up the Christian life of their students. Often this is being done in most unexpected ways; frequently it is being done with a breadth of comprehension and a Christ-like tolerance which would scarcely be acceptable to church officials with pharisaical inclinations, but it is nevertheless being done.

At the same time there are undoubtedly teachers in denominational colleges whose reputation is of the very best, who not only

have no interest in promoting the Christian life of their students but who are in revolt against the methods and traditions of the college as well as such direct and reasonable tests as are suggested by Professor Latourette and President Soper. It is a fact worthy of careful consideration that while the church Boards of Education and the denominational colleges have recently expended over sixty thousand dollars in college surveys, this really determining factor has usually been entirely ignored. The promoters of the Methodist Episcopal college survey which is now being organized give assurance that in this respect the survey which they are inaugurating will differ from most denominational college surveys heretofore made.

In a letter to the writer on the subject of the intellectual life project which the Association of American Colleges is now formulating, President Henry Suzzallo remarks:

> At the present stage of my thinking, I am of the belief that the chief difficulty in improving the intellectual life of our liberal arts colleges lies in the unresponsive attitude of the vast majority of our college faculties. The administrative leaders have been jolted out of their complacency; the average teacher or professor in our higher schools has not. They lack either the training to appreciate what is the matter or the enthusiasm and energy to make experimental changes. This comes out plainly in the hundreds of conversations I have had with individuals or committees of faculties in the last two years.

It is a fair question to ask whether President Suzzallo's remarks would not apply with equal force to the difficulty of improving the Christian character of many of our denominational colleges. However this may be, there are very few of these colleges which have undertaken to apply the acid test: *Are all the members of the faculty willing to face squarely and fairly the implications of membership in a college that claims or aspires to be Christian?*—*R. L. K.*

A New Appointment

At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Association of American Colleges held in the office of the Executive Secretary in New York, Friday, March 8, 1929, Mr. Archie M. Palmer, Assistant Director of the Institute of International Education, was elected Associate Secretary of the Association of American Colleges. Mr. Palmer will enter upon his work on August 1, 1929, and will be concerned more particularly with the "Research Department," the need for which was set forth by the Executive Secretary in his annual report at Chattanooga. It is hoped by this means to put the office of the Association in even better position to give adequate answers to the multitude of questions which come from the members regarding all phases of college administration and teaching.

Mr. Palmer received his A.B. degree from Cornell University and served for three years as the Secretary of the College of Arts and Sciences of that institution. He served three years, 1917–20, in the regular army in France and Germany during the World War, first as 2nd lieutenant and later as 1st lieutenant. He served one year in the sales research of the Procter and Gamble Company and two years as Alumni Secretary of Columbia University. During the last two years he has been Assistant Director of the Institute of International Education. He has received his M.A. from Columbia and will finish his residence requirements for the Ph.D. degree in the Department of College Administration in that institution in June, 1929.

Mr. Palmer is already well known to many members of the Council and Association and possesses rare equipment for the task upon which he is entering.—*R. L. K.*

I am a good deal disturbed at the failure of religious educational institutions and denominational colleges at the very point where they think they are strong. . . . I think the first thing they have to do is to take the matter of religious education more seriously.—*Bishop Francis J. McConnell.*

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE—A DEFINITION AND PROGRAM

PROFESSOR KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE
Yale University

What is a standard Christian college? We have what are called "standard colleges"—institutions which have been recognized as such by the government or some other agency. The minimum prerequisites for that recognition are usually an endowment of from half a million to a million dollars, a certain number of books in the library, adherence to specified minimum requirements for admission, the length of the course, and the size and preparation of the teaching staff. Only infrequently, however, have we set ourselves seriously to define what makes a college Christian, to outline the program which should be followed by an institution with such an aim, and to determine tests by which we can ascertain whether the college is fulfilling its Christian purpose. Yet such a task is of the greatest importance. The church is investing millions of dollars in its institutions of higher education and a large proportion of its young people are trained in them; the future character and even the existence of the church are partly determined by what is done in the schools that bear the Christian name.

The Christian college is based upon the conviction that in the Christian faith are values which are not to be obtained elsewhere, and that these are of prime importance in the educative process. Christlikeness of character, the end sought, defies any description which is at once brief and accurate. Roughly, however, it may be defined as a life of purity, honesty, and unselfishness, of creative, self-forgetting love. It is founded upon the conviction that God is like Christ, that in Christ we see what God is and what man may become. It is character redeemed and made over by the love of God. Christian education worthy of the name seeks to produce lives of this type, and by training and equipping them with the accumulated wisdom of the ages, to make them effective in the service of men and of God.

Manifestly, in achieving this end the impact of every phase of an institution's life has a part. If the effect of a college is to be

really Christian, not only the curriculum but the extra-curricular activities of the student must be permeated with and inspired by the Christian ideal. The social and athletic phases of a college's life are as truly a part of the educative process as is the class room.

It is obvious, too, that distinctively Christian education has much in common with education which is not so denominated. If man is "naturally Christian," if the Christian life means the fullest possible life, many educators will be attempting to carry out what are essentially Christian ideals in institutions which do not bear that name. This will be particularly the case in a land which, like our own, has for generations been under the influence of Christianity and many of whose educators have been trained in professedly Christian colleges. The Christian college, however, has the advantage of being able frankly to avow itself as such and to shape its life accordingly.

The curriculum of a Christian institution should have, as its two *foci,* man and God. It should seek to enlarge the intellectual and spiritual horizons of its students, to fit men for abundant life in fellowship with each other and with God and His universe, and to inspire and train students for the service of God through service to the race. This means that the curriculum should open to the student the physical world in which he lives and begin to acquaint him with all the wealth of knowledge which modern science has made available—in biology, astronomy, geology, physics, chemistry, and geography. It means, too, that there should be made available to the student the essentials of the past experience and thought of the race in such fields as philosophy, history, economics, and sociology. It naturally also implies that to the student should be made accessible the vistas of beauty in music, painting, sculpture, and literature. It means, moreover, that the student should be made acquainted with himself, with the laws of his body and his mind and the best means of utilizing them. It also implies that the student will be introduced to the religious heritage of the race and especially to that contained in the Bible and in the centuries of Christian experience.

The curricula of Christian colleges should be prophetic. They should be blazing new trails and not be pale imitations of the pro-

grams of state-supported institutions. Few Christian colleges are equipped to give professional training: by the size of their endowments they are usually limited to laying the broad cultural foundations upon which a professional training can later be built. Nor can they usually afford to multiply courses and departments. They can, however, experiment. By resolving to discover what Christian higher education should be and to differ, if necessary, from customary educational programs, they can make a rich contribution not only to the lives of their students but to education in general.

Whatever the Christian college does it should do with distinction. It should not offer courses which are beyond its means. If its financial resources are sufficient only for junior college work, it should do only that and do it well. If a senior college is later added it should be only when income fully warrants it. The Christian college, whatever else it may or may not be, should be honest. It is prostituting its name if it professes to give courses which it cannot give well.

With all of these generalizations most of us would agree. There are implications, however, which in practice some of our schools and colleges are not recognizing. Some, for example, are failing to reshape their curricula to take account of the international changes of the past few decades. We now have intimate relations with China and Japan as well as with Europe, yet in only a minority of our American colleges do courses in the history of the Far Orient find a place. Only an occasional course in philosophy acquaints students with the thought of India and China as well as of Europe. The attainment of peace is a major problem, yet few of our courses in history and international relations give attention to the study of the causes of war and of the devices by which it is proposed to eliminate or control them. Race prejudice is still an alarming phenomenon, yet many of our colleges give the problem scant recognition, and in some instances the spirit of the classroom and of the campus instead of militating against prejudice, encourages it. The United States, because of her enormous wealth and her rapid export of capital, is assuming a new and important rôle in the earth; but not all of the curricula of the Christian colleges apprise students of that

fact or stir in them the desire to make this rôle a wholesome one for the rest of the world. Ever more rapidly we are becoming a highly industrialized nation; but how far are our students being led to face the problems involved and to plan their lives so as to make these changes of benefit to all our citizens and not to a privileged few? Are all our colleges—as are some—fighting against the tendency to regard a college course merely as a means of increasing the graduates' income? Four years in a Christian college should add to the students' feeling of obligation to render service to his less fortunate fellows.

Some of our Christian colleges are giving careful instruction in physical hygiene, with personal advice and supervision. Most of our colleges should do more. By interested and expert counsellors they should help every student to understand the physical mechanism which is his and should help him to learn how to use it most efficiently. Those of us who know undergraduates are aware of the futility of expecting that they will observe methodically proper hours of sleep and an approved diet. The few who do are usually abnormal. We can, however, see that the chief facts about the body and its wholesome use are imparted and that students who wander dangerously far from them are encouraged to self-mastery.

Do we, in our courses on psychology or elsewhere, make accessible to our students the essential facts of mental hygiene? Do we make available wise and interested personal guidance in these matters? Do we give to boys and girls, who are shortly to form homes of their own, the main facts of sex, and such instruction as will help them wholesomely to bring into existence and rear the next generation? What are we doing to inculcate Christian ideals of the home and of family life? Do all of our colleges, for example, as does at least one, give instruction in that practical and essential basis of the home, the family budget?

The Christian college, moreover, should give careful thought to each student, should see that those who enter its halls are not ground through a course to a degree by a standardized machine, but that all have individual attention. It should feel that when a boy or a girl is dismissed from college or graduates only half awake it may be more the fault of the college than of the student.

The spirit and organization of the Christian institution should be such that the dull student is brought out, the average student encouraged and guided to his best effort, and the brilliant student stimulated to make the fullest possible use of his exceptional equipment. Those institutions which pay their chief attention to saving the dullards, those which seek primarily to develop the brilliant student with disregard of the interests of the rank and file, and those which, in effect, specialize on dull mediocrity, are alike falling short of the Christian standard.

Just how to give proper attention to each student is an ever perplexing problem, especially as colleges increase in size. In some institutions the solution lies partly in providing an adequate number of deans or official advisers, but in all it depends chiefly—as does so much else of the Christian character of the institution—upon the quality of the members of the faculty.

The standard Christian college will certainly provide, in some form, vocational guidance. Whatever the organizational provision for this, it will take advantage of all that common sense and recent technical study have taught us about helping a student in the choice of a life work. It will do something more: it will, as much of "personnel work" now fails to do, seek to inspire a student to the dedication of his life to the unselfish service of God and society and to look upon his occupation as a calling.

It goes almost without saying that the curriculum should include adequate courses on the Bible and on the history and philosophy of the Christian faith and that these should be in the hands of able, well-trained, and inspiring teachers.

The chapel services, moreover, deserve the careful and constant thought of the administration to keep them an aid to worship and a means of introducing students to and nourishing them in the Christian experience. Required attendance at chapel, now so strongly under fire, would seem normally to have a place on a Christian college's program. If students are told frankly that it is part of the life of the institution, and that colleges and universities where it is not required are always available elsewhere for the disgruntled, the existence of chapel may be a useful method of selecting a student body in sympathy with the college's ideals. Services at which attendance is required,

however, should be prepared for even more carefully than those at which it is voluntary. The galling feeling of compulsion can be largely eliminated from the student body if proper methods are employed. Here, as elsewhere in the administration of the college, it is probably good educational policy to call duly elected student representatives into counsel.

The effectiveness of the entire curriculum depends upon the character of the teaching staff. Occasionally a professor of Greek or of engineering is a more potent Christian influence than the occupant of the chair of Bible, and, on the other hand, much of the Christian influence of an institution is sometimes undone by a single scoffing teacher. No one has a right to an appointment to the staff of a Christian college who is not wholeheartedly and actively in sympathy with the professed purposes of the institution. This does not mean subscription to a given creed or to a specific confession of faith, or membership in a church of the denomination which supports the institution, but it does mean an experience of God and earnest and convincing Christian living.

This raises the moot question of academic freedom and tenure of office. There are obvious advantages both to the college and to the teacher in permanent appointment and in freedom of thought and speech. However, honesty and integrity are fully as important to society and to the intellectual life as is freedom of investigation. If at any time a teacher becomes convinced that he can no longer endorse the Christian approach to life, common honesty demands that he no longer draw his salary from funds given for avowedly Christian purposes. When a teacher has conscientiously departed from the Christian position and no moral delinquency has followed, the administration will, of course, give him every assistance in obtaining a position in an institution where the Christian stand is not deemed important. The administration would be recreant to its trust, however, if it lacked the courage to insist upon a resignation.

In the choice of a faculty, moreover, there are other important factors besides Christian character and purpose. It should go without saying that teachers should have the best scholastic training obtainable. It should also always be a matter of in-

quiry whether they have the ability to inspire students to hard, honest work and to creative thinking. The effectiveness of a curriculum and a teaching staff depends not only upon the range of subjects listed, but also upon the results which, through the teaching of these subjects, are registered in the students' minds and actions. Institutions bearing the name Christian should be distinguished for their application to the business at hand, for an exacting and conscientious determination to arrive at the truth, for eagerness for all new ideas which may in any possible way make for the happiness of the race and a richer knowledge of God and His world, and for painstaking examination of the validity of these ideas. Such an attitude depends largely upon the members of the teaching staff. Piety should never be considered a substitute for sound scholarship.

It should be a corollary of Christian character and purpose that the teacher has a personal interest in his students as individuals. While the teacher should be enthusiastic about his subject and be able to awaken interest in it, he must not think of himself merely as a guide to information on a particular subject and of students as so many possible historians, or chemists, or physicists; he must be interested in his pupils as human beings, and always be willing to take time for them and their problems. With the emphasis placed by the graduate schools and many of our universities upon research, the teacher faces the temptation of concentrating upon his laboratory and his study, of estimating his achievement by what is falsely called "productive scholarship"—the number of articles and books appearing over his name—and to think of students as unavoidable nuisances. This attitude, it must be confessed, is in no small degree due to the colleges which in practice base promotion and increases in salary upon this kind of productivity. It is not easy for an administration to stand against this tendency, for calls to other institutions usually come to the members of a faculty who are favorably known through their writings, and with the constant pressure of insufficient budgets the tendency is not to give advancement until forced by competition to do so. The Christian school and college, however, must value not only scholarship as witnessed by original research, but proven teaching ability and interest and success in dealing with students.

On the vexed problem of salaries, moreover, it should be said that the Christian college certainly owes to the members of its staff a living wage. A large salary should never be offered as the chief inducement to a prospective teacher. On the other hand, a college has no right to multiply courses at the expense of reasonable increases to the stipends of the members of the faculty.

As has been suggested, the curriculum is only one phase of the environment which educates the student. For many individuals, possibly the majority, the extra-curricular life has fully as great an influence. In determining the standards for a Christian college these must, accordingly, be given careful consideration.

The most prominent phases of the extra-curricular life are usually the social and athletic activities. On a large proportion of our campuses the social life is dominated by fraternities and sororities. It is, of course, an old question, and it is certainly still a debatable one, whether these organizations are, in the last analysis, wholesome or pernicious. They are, however, with us, and for most colleges the practical problem is not whether they should be permitted but how they can be made to contribute to the institution's best life. With proper encouragement and guidance fraternities and sororities can—and do—aid in the building of Christian character and to a better social and intellectual life. An administration having at heart the Christian purpose of the college will, of course, be on its guard against the abuses sometimes associated with fraternities—drinking, extravagant buildings, expensive entertainments, and the like. It will also see that through some medium—additional fraternities, a commons club, or a union—the facilities offered by fraternities shall be made available for all students.

The college has an obligation to see that men and women have an opportunity to meet each other wholesomely in a social way, and cannot escape the duty of supervising more or less closely formal and informal social engagements.

Athletics undoubtedly must have an important part on the program of every school and college. Equally obvious must be the purpose—wholesome recreation and physical health and development. The abuses are familiar—over-emphasis upon winning

games; subsidizing promising athletes either by the college or by the alumni, and in many devious ways; the week-end exodus for out-of-town games; extravagant salaries for coaches; the large sums spent on the great football games; the disruption of the regular life of the college, and the drinking and other dissipation attendant upon these events. Well known, too, are the attempts to eliminate these evils—the emphasis upon intramural sports, adequate medical supervision and advice to all students, making coaches regular and full-time members of the teaching staff, and the like. Some colleges have forbidden all intercollegiate contests and others have prohibited those which are subject to most frequent abuse, particularly football. Whatever the individual college's solution of the problem, it is patently the duty of the executive officers to be intimately familiar with the situation in the institutions for which they are responsible. The problem is one which requires unremitting and vigilant attention. Because of the relatively small size of many of our Christian institutions, we are often tempted here, as in our curricula, to take our cue from tax-supported universities. The very facts of our independence and our small size, however, give opportunity to experiment and we are under obligation to act without undue reference to what the state institutions are doing.

As to the other forms of extra-curricular activity—voluntary student religious organizations, the college paper, annuals, literary and dramatic clubs—it may be sufficient here to suggest that if the college authorities, without seeming to interfere too much with student initiative, can see that faculty members, chosen preferably by the students, have an active advisory relation to each, the abuses that so easily creep in can be avoided and the organizations be made a constructive part of the educative process.

The choice of a student body is only less important than a wisely ordered program and a carefully selected teaching staff. If a college or school is to succeed in its attempt to be Christian it must have not only an avowedly Christian faculty, but at least a fair proportion of its student body must be actively sympathetic. This involves more than church membership, for often the church connection is purely formal. If an institution is to

be really Christian, therefore, the officers who are in charge of admission must not only know an applicant's scholastic record and see that he is reasonably upright in character, but by personal interviews with the applicant and his sponsors must seek to ascertain the prospective student's purpose in coming to college and his attitude toward the institution's objective. It is at least an open question whether in the selective processes of recent years scholarship has not been overemphasized, and whether room should not be made for students of only average intellectual gifts who give promise of useful and upright lives.

Finally, the key to the entire situation is the administration—the president and the board of trustees. If these, and especially the president, are determined that the institution shall be Christian, and if they show persistence and good judgment in seeking that end, a school or college which is Christian in its influence can be so kept and one which is not can be made so.

WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE?*

Dean Luther Allan Weigle
Yale Divinity School, Yale University

Most of the colleges of America have been founded by the churches or by Christian people who have had a distinct religious purpose. . . . The last half-century, however, has witnessed a general secularization of education, even in the colleges founded under Christian auspices and dedicated to Christian ends. . . . The result of all this expansion and secularization is that we can no longer rely upon the purposes of the founders or the circumstances of origin as a basis for determining whether or not a college is Christian. Too many changes have taken place. The intent of the founders may mean little to the actual life of the college today. . . . Is a college made Christian by the form of its organization, or by the type of control exercised over it by the churches? No, for there is no one form of organization, no

* An abridgment of an address delivered at Delaware, Ohio, on the occasion of the inauguration of Dr. Edmund D. Soper as President of Ohio Wesleyan University, February 14, 1929.

one type of control, which has exclusive right to be called Christian.

Positively, the Christian character of a college depends upon its maintenance in all of its corporate life of a Christian spirit, in fulfillment of a consciously avowed Christian purpose. Underlying all that it is and does, the Christian college possesses a philosophy of life, a faith concerning the ultimate structure of reality, which is rooted and grounded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. It shares in the purpose of the great Teacher, who came that men might have life and have it more abundantly. . . .

We may briefly state four outstanding principles of the Christian philosophy of life as it underlies the work of the Christian college:

1. The primary interest of the Christian college is in persons, rather than in subjects or in things. . . . The Christian college is personality-centered. Its fundamental aim is not the extension of human knowledge as such, but the development and enrichment of the personality of the student. Its primary method is the fellowship of teacher and learner in the quest for truth, for beauty, and for good. It teaches by the dynamic contact of life upon life, the friendship of person with person.

2. The Christian college finds its standards of personal worth and social good in Jesus' Way of life. It believes that Jesus understood life's true values; and it undertakes to base its own corporate life upon his ethical principles, and to lead its students to accept them. That means the acceptance and practice of the principle of love as he enunciated it and lived it. It means the practice of the Golden Rule, and the estimation of all good and all greatness in terms of service. It means the acceptance of that remarkable reversal of the judgments of the world respecting happiness, which is recorded in the Sermon on the Mount. It means fighting the battle against one's own sin, not merely in the field of external behavior, but in the inward depths of the heart, in the secret springs of thought and motive. It means a resolute stripping oneself of all sham, pretence, and insincerity, and living a true, straightforward, honest and fearless life.

3. The Christian college accepts Jesus' revelation of the character and disposition of God. Jesus' Way of life was grounded in his understanding of the structure of the universe. Love, forgiveness, mercy, sincerity, and good will are principles of His life, not merely because they are ideal aspirations of His own, or because men have agreed to regard these as virtues, but because they lie at the heart of reality. God has these qualities. God is love, forgiveness, mercy, grace, and truth. . . . Without loss of the principle of God's sovereignty, or blurring out of His justice, Jesus' characteristic and constant emphasis was upon the character and disposition of God as the Father of men. . . . The miracle in Jesus Christ is that he not only taught this gospel, this good news—about the character and disposition of God. He Himself was that gospel. He lived it. In Him the character and disposition of God "dwelt among us, full of grace and truth.". . . However far above and beyond our limited minds the being of God may lie, however rightly reverence shrinks from the attempt to encompass Him in fragile concepts and partial definitions, it is the faith of the Christian that in Christ we stand face to face with ultimate Reality, we catch a vision of the heart of God.

4. The Christian college seeks to know the truth, and is loyal to the truth whenever and wherever found. Its Christian purpose is not to be conceived in static, dogmatic terms as the mere transmission from generation to generation of fixed, changeless formulas once for all delivered to the saints. The ideas of growth, of progress, of discovery are essential to its being both because it is a college and because it is Christian. If its Christian faith and purpose are to be stated, as we have stated them, in terms of the supreme value of personality, the eternal worth of Jesus' principles of living, and the truth of his portrayal of the character and disposition of God, there is ample room and freedom for the quest of new ranges of truth and for criticism of older formulations which fresh experience proves to be inadequate. . . . It is the business of the Christian college, not to repress, but to afford stimulus, materials, and fellowship to the eager ambition of youthful minds. And it can do this in a spirit of loyalty to Jesus Christ, not in antagonism to him.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE*

PRESIDENT EDMUND D. SOPER
Ohio Wesleyan University

The question of the personal influence of the faculty, the content of their teaching and their philosophy of life is of great significance—it cannot be overestimated. We have thousands of illustrations of students whose whole outlook on life has been changed during their college course. Why should it not be so? that is what college is for. But the change is not always in the same direction. There are those who have been given a new grip on themselves and on the world in which they live. They have found themselves and have gained a vantage point, from which they have been able to see the universe and interpret it and relate themselves to it and its great luminous center, God.

Were this the only side of the shield we would be fortunate. Students, however, are being changed by their college course, but not always for the better. Unfortunately we have hundreds of illustrations—I dread to say thousands, though I feel quite sure it is true—of those who have come out of college with no satisfying philosophy of life and with less serious purpose than they had when they entered. What religious experience they possessed is gone; they are "without God and hope in the world." And this result can be accounted for by one thing above all others. They have come under the influence of some member or members of the faculty who have turned them away from what might have been a Christian life devoted to the service of humanity and of Jesus Christ.

The question which is immediately suggested is, can a college be considered Christian in anything but name if in the faculty there are men whose influence, if it succeeds in accomplishing its work in the life of a student, will inevitably lead him away from his Christian profession and from the religious foundation and traditions of the institution? We may say it is not a Christian college just in proportion that such men have influence in

* An abridgment of the address delivered by Dr. Edmund D. Soper upon the occasion of his inauguration as the seventh president of Ohio Wesleyan University, February 15, 1929.

the faculty and among the students. We may take another step and declare that it is all wrong and that the college ought to exercise its right to control its faculty so that students shall not be subjected to such influences. Just as soon, however, as this position is taken, the question of academic freedom is raised. The college does not have the right to restrain its faculty.

Coming directly to the subject in hand, I will state my position. It is this, that the Christian college possesses the right to control its teaching and that it is in duty bound to do so, in order that it may fulfill the intention of its founders and the purpose of those who have sacrificed for it. It must be able to give assurance to parents and friends as well as students themselves that the influences which prevail shall be truly Christian.

A solemn weight of responsibility rests upon the university to carry out the aims which the founders had in mind. This becomes all the more weighty when one thinks of the hundreds, and even thousands of men and women, preachers and laymen, who have believed in a college of this kind and have sacrificed, sometimes out of pitifully small incomes, in order to make it possible for the school of their love to continue its mission. Let no one suppose that this kind of heroism lies altogether in the past. The same spirit is with us still, and it is one of the proud legacies of Ohio Wesleyan. May she always continue so to stand for the principles which have characterized her in days gone by that simple-minded and devout men and women may be convinced that they are serving the highest interests of the kingdom of God when standing by Ohio Wesleyan with their money and their prayers. This college has literally been built on faith and love and sacrifice and is in as great need of these to-day as ever before. She is greatly in want at the present time of buildings and equipment, scholarships, and endowment. I can scarcely see how it will be possible for her to continue to produce her typical product without an increase of material resources. Yet with all this—and it must constantly be kept before us—the most fundamental thing for which we must constantly rededicate ourselves is that we may remain true to the ideals which have been responsible for the product in life and character of which all of us are so proud.

How can this be secured? I reply that it must be done by securing members of the faculty who see clearly what the aim of the college is and who whole-heartedly give themselves to its realization. There is no more important function in connection with an educational institution than the choice of those who are to join the teaching staff. The men and women who join the faculty should accept heartily and without reserve the purpose for which the school stands. This does not mean accepting a creed or signing a statement as a guarantee of orthodoxy. It does not mean being a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, though I can see how probable and even desirable it is that a good proportion of the faculty should be Methodists. It does mean that the candidate should be a Christian in the essential meaning which is conveyed by the word.

A professor must feel as much at home in the chapel as he does in the laboratory, for worship is as essential to a Christian college as lectures and classroom discussions. More than intellectual fitness is being required by the colleges. The college professor has to deal with young life at a very impressionable age. If that be true there is nothing else to do than to look for the men who, in addition to scholastic attainment, have that something which makes them intelligent and sympathetic guides to young men and women in the deeper problems of life.

When a member of the faculty has thus been secured he is to be trusted. This is of fundamental importance. A man must feel that even though he may differ from his colleagues or from the administration, he need not hesitate to speak out his full mind. He knows he is trusted and has been given the full right to teach what he believes to be the truth, with no fear of interference or of humiliating criticism.

So long as we continue in the business of education, differences and variations in viewpoint and attitude will continue to exist. We must not only expect them; we must give them a welcome. It is the only way to make progress in the field of knowledge; it is also the only way to preserve self-respect and engender the enthusiasm requisite to good teaching anywhere.

How far should this freedom I am talking about be allowed? Why should this question be asked? What I have in mind is the

freedom of a Christian teacher. When his fundamental attitude to Christ is assured I can see no limit to his freedom. He must be made to feel that the only restraint which he should feel is that imposed by his own conscience and his sense of what is true and good.

When all has been said that can be said to make clear this position, another question insistently demands an answer. What of the present faculty? You have been speaking of the conditions on which a new member is brought in, but what if there is a man here or there who obviously does not answer to your description? Difficult as the question may be, I do not think there need be any hesitation. The same principle applies here that has been upheld from the beginning. The preservation of the Christian character of the institution is the primary consideration. Should a teacher find himself holding views contrary to the position of a Christian college, it would seem to me that common honesty would lead him to feel the anomaly of the situation—that he is in an institution whose position is well known but in which he can not teach without doing violence to that position and that it would be better for him quietly to retire.

The areas of contest in academic circles have changed during recent decades. Geology was a sore point after the middle of the last century. Was the earth created in six days of twenty-four hours each, as some believe, or has it come to its present form through an evolving process lasting through millions of years? The problem was not as difficult as some thought. The significant line of cleavage was not where so many thought it was, between those who held to the doctrine of a fiat creation which lasted six days and those who held to the doctrine of evolution. It lay elsewhere. The men of deeper insight saw that the real difference was between two groups of men, both of which held the evolutionary theory. One thought it necessary to bow God politely out of His universe, who believed that the God-concept was otiose now that we had hit upon evolution as the explanation of how things came to be what they were. The other group accepted the evolutionary hypothesis as cordially as the other, but, unlike them, held fast its grip on God as just as essential to a final explanation of the universe as He was before. One scholar

retained his Christian experience and the other did not. One would maintain the Christian character of a college and the other could not.

I might use other illustrations but can only allude to one or two. There are those who, when the results of literary and historical criticism began to change our views of the Bible, lost faith in any divine revelation at all. But there were those who were convinced that God's voice could be heard just as clearly in the Bible, though in a somewhat different manner, as in the old days of belief in plenary, verbal inspiration. The essential thing was to hear His voice, and when men were able to do that they became the guides sought after to direct young people and teach in our Christian schools. These battles for the most part lie in the past, except for belated communities which have been left behind in the progress of thought and still need to fight over the old battles in order to come into line and take their place where the real battles are being waged now.

To-day the most difficult problems are those which lie in the fields of psychology and sociology. Our inquiry is, where is the line of cleavage from the standpoint of the Christian college? I believe it lies fundamentally at the same place where it lay in the contests of past decades. In the welter of viewpoints and theories which are flying around and confusing the laity and, it may be, the professionals themselves, it is quite evident that some of them are flatly contradictory to the Christian philosophy of life and if they prevailed would end the hold any Christianity worthy of the name has on the minds of intelligent men. I think this is as clear to-day as it will be when the mists rise and we see the full significance of what is taking place in the confused ferment of the present day. Any theory which denies implicitly or explicitly a God with whom personal beings can have conscious relations, any theory which so interprets the life of a human being that there is no self worthy of the name left and which thus desecrates the citadel of personality, any theory which so ties human life down to necessary reactions that all significant self-direction and freedom are denied—I say, any such theory is inimical to the existence of a real Christian experience in the life of a human being, and will, I am convinced, damage the faith and outlook of any who accept it.

There is a danger which has been pointed out as possible in the whole argument which I have been making. It is the danger of paternalism, of the hot house, of the sequestered nook, as if we were afraid that our students might get a breath of free air, or really be thrown into perplexing doubts. Such an outcome is very far from my thought. Students on coming to college must be taken into the full stream of the world's life, they must know what is going on. Of all the sins of the teacher and of an educational institution, there is none more heinous than that of obscurantism. The student has the right to demand that he be faced with every side of a question; each side being presented faithfully and fully.

If this is a Christian school it must demand two things: first, that its faculty should not be afraid of facts and should present them and the theories based on them freely and clearly. It must be left to the student to decide between them. But, second, and this is a crucial consideration, the Christian college is also duty bound to let the student see that there is a Christian interpretation and that it is consistent and reasonable and can be held without doing violence to any of the facts. One might almost say that the function of the Christian teacher is to give his testimony as to the truth and recommend it and show its strength so convincingly that every student will be led to see it in its best light and give it favorable consideration.

But there is another factor, and it is with a consideration of this that I bring this address to a close. Ohio Wesleyan is a church school. Will the church be able to enter into this relationship and play its part so that the college may be conscious that it has the church whole-heartedly back of it? The University has many needs, financial and otherwise, but there is no need so great as this, that the church which founded it and has supported it should now give it support in full measure. This means that Ohio Wesleyan must be trusted even when at times things are said and done whose meaning is not at once fully apparent. In the nature of the case, if an institution of higher learning is to perform its appointed task it must be constantly pushing ahead in its ideas and practices. Without such forward steps, some of them more or less tentative, it would cease to be worthy

of the position it holds, that of leadership in the things of the spirit and mind. In taking these steps it must be bold and daring—is that not the very spirit of Christianity at its best? If the church, however, should hold back and be afraid and reject its school because of suspicion on the part of timorous souls, neither the church nor the university can be at its best and the outlook for the future will be dim and uncertain.

Many years ago I consecrated myself to foreign missionary service and became a student volunteer. Providentially I was detained in this country, but my purpose has never changed. My chief desire is to make Jesus Christ known and to bring in His Kingdom among men. My most urgent mandate is, I believe, from God Himself, and I now dedicate myself in this presence to Ohio Wesleyan and the cause of Christian education because I believe it is His will. My prayer is, May His will be done. Amen.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE REPLIES TO ITS CRITICS

PRESIDENT JOHN L. SEATON,
Albion College

An editorial recently appeared in *Zion's Herald* under the caption, "What Is the Matter with the Colleges?" By implication, direct statement and misplaced emphasis it may carry to people not on the inside of colleges and universities an erroneous view of the institutions to which both state and church must look for leadership. For that reason a brief reply is made to the main issues raised in the editorial.

It is quite the fashion for certain persons to assume that the "colleges and universities are hotbeds for the cultivation of drinking, cigarette-smoking, 'necking,' and demoralizing dances." After twenty-four years as a teacher, administrator, and college secretary, I testify that there is less drinking among college students than there used to be, when saloons encircled the campus, and much less of collateral vices. The students of to-day are stronger in body and mind, cleaner in habits than they were when I was young—and that in spite of the great

changes made by the war, the world-wide unleashing of ugly passions for a period of ten years, and the varied reactions which are loosely described as the "revolt of youth." With the single exception of cigarette smoking every evil among the college youth of to-day can be more than matched by the evils of the past.

Since my life is spent largely within the college, I cannot speak so confidently of youth outside of the college, but I do not believe that they are growing worse. William Allen White, who, as a newspaper man, ought to know them pretty well, says that they are "better than their grandfathers were, clear back to the Garden of Eden," and that the "middle-aged liar who talks about the good old days and blameless boys of long ago should take a reef in his imagination."

In the colleges, especially in those on private and church foundations, there is much systematic instruction designed to correct the evils of the day, and to produce better men and women. There, also, is an insistent pressure of ideals that tends to change undesirable habits and ways of thinking that young people bring from their homes and their high schools. We may properly ask, also, what institutions are making a definite stand against the tobacco habit. "Smokers" are not unknown in many churches, just as they are not unknown in some colleges, and the tobacco habit is quite as common among members of the official boards of churches as it is among college students, and much more common than it is among college faculties. The same thing may be said about dancing, card playing, and some other practices often regarded as evils. Why, therefore, should the colleges be singled out for special criticism?

I am more concerned about some other matters than I am about these debatable practices. Is it true that the colleges "are being sadly commercialized" as the editorial asserts? I think not. Money is necessary, but it is not sought for itself. It is sought in order to provide a better scholastic training and a more human environment for the students. The recent great gift of Mr. Harkness to Harvard University was made not to enrich the University, but to enrich life by providing for relatively small groups in the midst of a vast institution and for something of the spirit of home in those groups.

Far from desiring "large and still larger enrolments" many colleges and universities are restricting attendance to such a degree that they are sharply criticized for excluding worthy young men and women who, though not brilliant, might profit by college life. Here in Michigan we have 175,000 Methodists, but our college will receive only 800 students. The state institutions of higher learning are unable to restrict enrolments by direct methods but many of them are trying to do it by indirect methods.

Though I have been so long in college life and am a member of numerous educational associations, I have yet to find what the editorial regards as a significant "turning away from the ancient view that education ought to contribute first of all to breadth of culture." Nor have I heard anyone argue that a "course in bookkeeping is as valuable as the study of Greek classics in the production of richness of life." Perhaps such an argument could be made. The value of any course depends very largely on how it is taught and by whom. Some of the deadliest work I ever have witnessed has been in teaching the classics—and I say this in spite of the many parasangs that during seven years of my student life I traveled in Greek literature. On the other hand, bookkeeping, like geography, might be taught so as to compass with informing skill and even with romantic charm a vast range of human life and experience; certainly, the story of money and banking contains more of interest and value to civilization than do the campaigns of Caesar.

Moreover, we have a new and significant emphasis upon breadth of learning. The reading courses and final examinations of Harvard, the honors courses at Swarthmore and other colleges, and the increasing requirements in liberal education for admission to professional and technical schools are illustrations. Further, the great universities are giving increasing attention to art and music. The University of Michigan has recently absorbed a school of music and arranged to give music more credit in its various schools. It, also, has received from the Carnegie Corporation a gift of $100,000 to be spent in five years to promote the study of fine arts among university students. As

one more illustration among many it may be noted that the education of negroes was at one time almost wholly vocational except for the minor emphasis of a few church schools. It is no longer so. Negro education aspires to everything that white education has "willed, or hoped, or dreamed of good."

"And what of the faculties?" It would be easy to assume from reading the editorial that nearly all the teachers of a previous generation were great teachers, and that now they have been replaced with poor ones. The plain fact is that no generation has many great teachers. Only three or four names need to be mentioned in the marvelous Athenian era. A half dozen more will bring us down to modern times. How many teachers strong enough to be widely known or long remembered has Methodism with its strong emphasis on education and its numerous schools produced? Or, making the inquiry personal, how many superior teachers did any of us have? I could mention only one in my high school, and two in my college years. I should hesitate to say how few I had in Boston University and later in Harvard. A great man under whom I studied in one of those institutions had a pedagogical method so bad as almost to nullify his teaching. He, therefore, was not a great teacher. Most of the teachers in all ages and institutions are routine men. Rarely do we find the great spirit with skill to teach and with power to kindle life to its best. Probably the colleges and universities are as well supplied with teachers of that kind now as they ever have been.

And what of the alumni whom the editorial regards as suffering from too frequent and too urgent appeals for financial assistance? Perhaps they have heard too much about the need of money from their Alma Maters. I seldom have heard anything else from the colleges and universities in which I was a student, but that is a fault of the past rather than the present. There is a new and vigorous movement toward the "alumni university," or college, and toward "continuing education," as it is significantly called. The work being done at Amherst is a good illustration.

The "donors" of large sums to colleges and universities are charged by the editorial with seeking to control their gifts and

inferentially the institutions to which the gifts are made. I doubt, however, that at any previous period they gave so freely or attached so few strings to their benefactions, as they do now. The day of domination through gifts exists and has existed mostly in the imagination. In a varied experience extending over many years I never but once had a restriction proposed that could have been an embarrassment. That gift was promptly declined. Administrators and trustees always have that privilege and usually exercise it, but still a great stream of money pours into the colleges and universities to be used as the authorities think best.

In regard to honorary degrees the colleges and universities are far more conservative now than they used to be. The editorial should praise them for their progress instead of criticizing them for practices belonging mostly to the past. I could mention one small Methodist college, much in need of money, that for five years of recent history granted no honorary degree. It would be hard to match that record in the old days when "degree mills" were common and even the Ph.D. degree could be had from many small schools hardly competent to grant the A.B. degree. I regret to say that some of those colleges were in my own church. In spite of steady pressure from many influential people the standard colleges now grant comparatively few honorary degrees and I doubt that they ever grant them for mercenary reasons. Mr. William B. Munro's statement in *The Atlantic Monthly* is a slander on most of the colleges and universities. I might add that in other respects his article shows a comprehensive ignorance of what is going on in the college world, or an attempt to make a general case out of a few facts, mostly misapprehended.

At times when I am weary with the effort to provide better equipment, libraries and laboratories for teachers and students, I find myself longing for the old days and simpler ways. But the longing is in vain. Education and the life it serves are too complicated. Equally vain, I think, is the dream, described in the editorial, of "a great prophet of education" who "will come out of the desert . . . secure an abandoned barn, an old desk, and a few benches, . . . enlist three or four great souls like

Williams, McCabe, Winchester, Rice, Briggs, and Bowne to assist him in his undertaking," and thus "lead us in a better way." It should be noted that all of these men taught in strong institutions, and even in their day they might not have been ready to enlist for service in a barn. It is a fair guess that they would not do it now, for they would know how useful are such tools as libraries and laboratories, and they would know how to use them without cramping the spirit. "The teacher is the school" but in this scientific age, or any age likely to come, he cannot do his best work without suitable buildings and equipment, or make his full contribution to "genuine learning, breadth of culture, high idealism, creative art, and all that make for sweetness and light and loving service to our fellow men."

THE SEMINARY WORLD

Gardiner M. Day

News From The Seminaries

A significant announcement comes from the Chicago Theological Seminary of the appointment of Cecil M. Smith as instructor in religious music to take office in the fall of 1929. More than a year ago the Faculty of the Seminary recommended the appointment of an instructor in music, and it feels particularly fortunate in having secured Mr. Smith, who after graduating from Chicago received his Master's degree from Harvard. While at Harvard he worked under Dr. A. T. Davison and was the accompanist for the Harvard Glee Club as well as organist for various churches. He is the son of Professor Gerald B. Smith whose recent untimely death leaves so large a gap in the theological world. Mr. Smith will give courses aimed to develop musical taste through understanding of the functions of religious music and through the appreciation of its best traditions.

From Drew Seminary at Madison, New Jersey, comes the announcement of the plan of "Brothers College," a college of liberal arts established in connection with the seminary at Madison. The college opened last fall with a freshman class. Next

year another class will be admitted until finally at the end of three years the college should have its four classes. While not a denominational college, it yet aims to foster the development of character as well as knowledge. It is worth while quoting part of its statement of purpose here:

> As an adventure in excellence Brothers College will not attempt to minister to all types of college students or to all the differing and opposing purposes of college students. While fully appreciating the value of technical training, it feels that as a College of Liberal Arts its primary emphasis should be cultural rather than commercial or vocational. It would, therefore, prefer not to attract the student whose sole purpose in attending college is to increase his earning capacity. Again, while recognizing that social and extra-curricular activities have some place in student life, Brothers College sees the more fundamental values threatened by the growing importance attached to these activities in many American colleges. It would, therefore, prefer not to attract the student whose chief purpose in attending college is social enjoyment or competition in intercollegiate sports. . . . The purpose of Brothers College is not exclusively intellectual. As an adventure in excellence, it desires excellence in character as well as in scholarship. It desires to make its students sensitive not only to the joys of understanding and the games of the mind, but also to the appreciation of beauty and the value of religious faith.

As we go to press the Twentieth Annual Convocation of the Yale Divinity School will be held. Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will deliver the Lyman Beecher Lectures on the subject "Preaching with Authority," while the Nathaniel W. Taylor Lectures will be by Professor Frank C. Porter who will endeavor to give some of the results of his long study of St. Paul in a series of lectures called "Light from Paul on Present Problems of Christian Thought." In addition the Terry Lectures on the relation of religion to science will be given by Dr. J. Y. Simpson, Professor of Natural Science in New College, who will speak on "Nature: Cosmic, Human and Divine." At the same time Yale Divinity School announces the creation of a new chair of public speaking to which Professor W. H. Greaves of Victoria College, University of Toronto, has

been called. It will be Dr. Greaves' particular task to train the students of the Divinity School in the technique of good public preaching and speaking.

Summer Schools

As summer approaches announcements begin to come in of the various summer schools which the seminaries carry on. A few years ago there were no summer schools conducted by seminaries, but so rapid has been the movement toward the use of the summer for educational purposes, and so valuable has it been to ministers who are unable to find time for study in the winter months that the number of summer schools has increased tremendously. The Auburn Theological Seminary will hold a summer session next July in which about seventy-five students are expected to enroll. Among the instructors at this school will be Dr. John Timothy Stone, Pastor of North Presbyterian Church of Chicago and Reverend William H. Leach, editor of *Church Management*. In addition, a large number of the regular staff of the Seminary, including President Harry L. Reed, will also teach.

The Union Theological Seminary will hold its summer school July 8–August 16 and has announced on its staff Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, President Henry Sloane Coffin, both of Union, Dr. Henry H. Tweedy, of Yale Divinity School, and Professor Henry N. Weiman, of Chicago Theological Seminary.

Chicago Theological Seminary will hold its summer session of two terms, the first beginning June 17th and the second July 25th, and its faculty, as usual, will represent some of the finest religious thinking in the country.

EPISCOPAL POSTULANTS AT LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

WARDEN ARTHUR T. REASONER

Leonard Hall is endowed by the Diocese of Bethlehem as a church institution to furnish a home for the postulants of our own church, who are getting their arts education and degree at Lehigh University. The cost to each student is very little, in comparison; at present each student pays us $200 per year for room and board. He must also sign a note additional for $300 a year, but that is canceled on day of his ordination. That is, the the amount of the cost of his year's maintenance, additional to the $200. The University gives our boys free tuition (which to others is now $400 per year). There are some additional fees, medical, athletic, library, etc., which are collected, to the amount of about $50, part of which is a deposit returned at the end of the year.

We furnish at the Hall everything that our students need for themselves in the home—all furnishings, bedding, towels, etc., which are kept laundered for them.

We have also in the house a well-equipped chapel, where a service is held five evenings of the week, immediately before dinner, by two of the students. Holy Communion is celebrated for them at least twice each week, Saints' days additional. The Warden lives in the house and is always available for conference or any need.

The Hall also runs three missions in the vicinity, which are under direction of the Warden, but the students themselves are in charge of the services, and church schools, except for Holy Communions. For this work a small compensation is given to those appointed over the work. Of course, there is not work enough for all.

We have, this year, sixteen in residence. Our capacity is about eighteen, although by crowding we might handle more, but our policy is not to crowd them in, but to give each student sufficient room and equipment for the best work possible. We have a very competent chef in the kitchen, and we try to give the boys a good substantial diet, as well-balanced as we can.

At present we take boys from any diocese, after our own postulants are given their places, up to capacity. Also, we make no distinction in cost to our own boys or those from other dioceses. Such regulations of course are subject to change.

The Hall is now sufficiently endowed so that we need to make no further appeal for funds for it.

THE NEW CURRICULUM OF THE OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Robert L. Kelly

When *Theological Education in America* appeared in 1924, attention was called to the fact that as far back as 1870 nearly a third of the entire course of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology was devoted to practical (known in that day as pastoral) theology and that an unusually large block of time was assigned to the development of the "preacher," including a course in "interpretation" which was exegesis with special homiletical application. There was, however, at that time no trace of sociology or of religious education yet to be detected.

Oberlin Graduate School now announces a new system of curriculum requirements for the Bachelor of Divinity Degree and the outline of this course is of particular interest not only because of its contents but also because of the technique of its production.

Dean T. W. Graham is authority for the information that the new curriculum was worked out by the faculty and that, incidentally, they had a good time in doing it, with a view of developing a curriculum which would give the most effective training to men and women who are preparing for the parish ministry. The faculty began with a job analysis, in an attempt to discover what were the religious needs, personal and community, which the average minister was expected to meet. They then tried to determine what were the resources which a man must have in himself or available in order to meet these needs, and on the basis of this list they drew up the statement of courses which would be best designed to provide such.

In their study they were constantly checked by men who are actively engaged in all forms of parish work. At one stage they invited to Oberlin men who are doing successful work in a dozen different types of parishes, and spent a very profitable day of conference with them, going over their results and getting their criticisms and suggestions.

As a prerequisite they announce a liberal arts course in a standard college. They are interested that the ministers in the making shall have had work of a high order in English composition, English literature, a modern foreign language, philosophy (including logic), psychology, at least two social sciences, history, one physical or biological science, and education. They also recommend that the student shall have pursued the study of Latin and Greek for at least one year each and that he shall have taken German as his modern foreign language.

There is a definite list of required courses as indicated below:

A. THE NATURE OF RELIGION

I. The Nature of Religion.
   1. Comparative Religion.
   2. The Psychology of Religion.
   3. The Philosophy of Religion.

B. THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

II. The Background of Christianity.
   1. Old Testament History and Literature.
   2. The Development of Hebrew Religion.
   3. A Critical Study of One Book or Group of Books in the Old Testament.

III. The Foundation of Christianity.
   1. New Testament History and Literature.
   2. The Life and Teaching of Jesus.
   3. A Critical Study of One Section of the New Testament.

IV. The Nature of Christianity.
   1. The Psychology of Christian Character.
   2. Christian Ethics.
   3. Christian Theology, Historic and Modern.
   4. The Development of a Personal Creed.

V. The History of Christianity.
   1. An Outline Course in Church History to the End of the Reformation Period.
   2. American Church History, with special emphasis upon recent and current problems.
   3. A Source Study of One Historic Problem or Period.

VI. Christian Literature, Music and Art.
   1. Great Religious Literature.
   2. Church Music and Hymnology.
   3. Church Architecture and Christian Art.

C. The Work of the Christian Minister

VII. Homiletics and Public Worship.
   1. The Fundamentals of Sermon Construction.
   2. A Year's Preaching.
   3. Effective Speaking.

VIII. Religious Education.
   1. The Fundamentals of Religious Education.
   2. The Organization of Religious Education.
   3. A Seminar in One Problem.

IX. Church Administration.
   1. Church Administration, Pastoral Functions and Polity.
   2. Ministerial Ethics and Practices.

X. Social Problems.
   1. The Family.
   2. Modern Social and Industrial Movements.
   3. Modern Peace Movements.

XI. Missions.
   1. The History of Missions.
   2. Problems of Modern Missions.

Provision is made for the students to spend the summer following the junior year in a designated city actively engaged in some factory, office or store job, during which time they shall meet twice a week in a seminar group for the study of special city problems and during which time also each student shall be engaged in the activities as a city dweller in some church.

During the summer following the middle year the student shall engage in definite work in country towns or villages within reach

of Oberlin and shall have similar experience to that stated above in the study of the problems of the country community.

The announcement of this new curriculum concludes with this statement:

> This suggested curriculum is the result of two years careful work on the part of the Curriculum Committee of the School of Theology. The Committee has had the help of a number of technical experts in theological curricula, a large number of men who are engaged in parish ministry, both at home and abroad, and a number of laymen whose views on the needs of the church command respect. The curriculum offerings of all the other seminaries of first rank, and some recent surveys of theological education, notably that made by Dr. Robert L. Kelly, were carefully reviewed. This curriculum is therefore based upon a knowledge of the needs of the church which are to be met by its ministers, a careful estimate of the content and skill courses necessary to prepare men to meet these needs, and a weighing of the present practice in the best theological seminaries in America and abroad.

A new board of higher education, to take over the administration of the University of Oregon, Oregon State Agricultural College, and the three state normal schools has been established in Oregon by act of the recent session of the Legislature, and all schools will come under the new régime July 1, 1929.

Elimination of duplications of courses and departments, greater efficiency of administration, and a considerable lessening of political rivalry between institutions is expected as a result of the measure.

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

Official Organ of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, Edited by Ismar J. Peritz, Professor of Biblical Literature, Syracuse University

WOMEN AS OFFICIALS IN THE CHURCH

Recent Associated Press dispatches indicate that the Presbyterian Church is on the eve of a discussion on the question of the rights of women as officials in the church. Presbyterianism is conservative, with strong leanings toward the authority of the Scriptures; and it is highly probable that the Biblical argument will have a prominent place in the discussion. What has a modern use of the Bible to contribute, and how may Biblical instructors be of service in suggesting a discriminate use of the Biblical material?

Of signal importance is the recognition that Biblical opinion on this, as on many subjects, is by no means uniform, but differs according to the circle whence it sprung and the time it circulated. On the subject of woman the two Old Testament religious leaders, the priests and the prophets, radically differed. The priests stood for woman's exclusion. This probably was due to a primitive and naive conception of woman's unfitness to serve in the sanctuary on account of her peculiar physiological make-up and periodical condition, which was held to be ceremonially unclean and defiling. This sentiment expressed itself in the Levitical regulations (Lev. XII), according to which it required a woman twice as long to become ceremonially purified from the birth of a maid-child as from that of a man-child. In later times a woman could not be a priestess in Hebrew religion;* and with the growth of the ritual developing into Pharisaism, she became increasingly detached from contact with the sanctuary, segregated in the temple in a "court of women," culminating in the daily Jewish prayer: "Blessed art thou, Lord, our king, God of the universe, that thou hast not made me a woman."

But with the prophets it was not so. They recognized no class distinctions, but with broad sympathy for common human-

* The earlier status of woman in the Hebrew religion is discussed in the writer's "Woman in the American Hebrew Cult," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1898; Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, Five Volume Edition, article "Woman."

ity held: "Would that all Jehovah's people were prophets, that Jehovah would put his Spirit upon them." (Numb. II: 29.) Woman consequently was not debarred from the office of the prophet: Miriam functioned by the side of Moses; Deborah by the side of Barak; and Huldah the prophetess appears in the time of Jeremiah to have been the only authority in the religious circle of Jerusalem who could officially advise what should be done with the newly discovered "book of the law" (2 Kings XXII). With Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth, in contrast with Pharisaic exclusivism, the prophetic liberalism regarding woman's place reappeared. Jesus surrounded himself with ministering women, showed no disposition to treat them as inferior, and considered them equally worthy of his attention and cultivation (Lk. VIII: 3f.; X: 38–42; Jn. IV). In the early church women were among the original number of disciples, and shared in the pentecostal gift of the Spirit (Act. I: 14). Paul's injunction that women should keep silence in the churches (which shows that they were not silent), not appear unveiled in public "because of the angels" (I Cor. XI: 10); and his omission of the women as witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus will have to be credited to his Pharisaic training, which it appears clung to him unwittingly, but it will also have to be counterbalanced by his liberal assertion that there was neither "male nor female" in Christ Jesus.

But what needs chief emphasis is the fact that Christianity is not the outgrowth of priestly but of prophetic ideals; and that the official freedom woman enjoyed among the prophets is the criterion by which to judge her standing in Christianity.

There is, however, yet another consideration which points in the same direction. When Christianity made its appearance, two distinct religious institutions existed side by side in Judaism: the temple and the synagogue. The ministry of the temple was extremely circumscribed: it consisted of men of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron. But the synagogue, especially before the destruction of the temple, was altogether freer and democratic both in its purpose and make-up: anyone capable by intelligence and knowledge of performing its functions of religious instruction, of reading and exposition of the Scriptures, guiding its government, and the distribution of charities, was eligible.

There is evidence that in earlier times women held highest official positions in the synagogue.** But after the destruction of the temple, when some of its functions were incorporated into the service of the synagogue, and it became the only sanctuary of Judaism, women were excluded from its administration, and ultimately relegated to its galleries.

But what concerns us here is the fact that the Christian church was in its beginning not patterned after the temple but after the synagogue, which at the time of Christian origins knew of no restricted class to carry on its service and administration. The church at first shared this freedom and the women with it. It was only when the primitive simplicity of the early church was displaced by a reversion to ritualism and priestly ideals that the ministers of the church became priests in the older sense. When this ritual tendency reaches its climax in mediaeval times, the Catholic church is an exact reproduction of the Jewish temple, with the Pope as its high priest, the clergy with its vestments the priests and Levites, and the Holy Mass its sacrifices. Thus is lost to the church its precious possession of the universal priesthood of all believers and with it the free status of woman.

With Christianity perpetuating the universalism of the prophets and Jesus and the early democracy of the synagogue, and with the increased knowledge of the place of woman in the world, all discriminations against woman in either state or church are obsolete—*I. J. P.*

AN EXPERIMENT IN CORRELATION AND ORGANIZATION OF COURSES AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL*

Professor Charles M. Bond,
Department of Religious Education, Bucknell University

In one of the most significant recent surveys of the moral and religious situation in college life,[1] it is found that the word most descriptive of the situation in the colleges is the word

** See the writer's article "Synagogue" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, paragraph 7.

* A paper read at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, New York, December 29, 1928. Bibliography, p. 504.

"confusion." One came to the same conclusion after having attended the faculty conference on religion in the colleges held in Princeton in February, 1928.[2] Again this conclusion received tremendous support from a study of *Bulletin* VI of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education.[3] To these evidences may be added that contained in a monograph recently published by the Religious Education Association.[4] One cannot spend half a dozen years in the colleges with his eyes and ears open and not come to the conclusion that "confusion" is the descriptive term to be used. Especially is this true of these activities which we hold to be our major interest in the college life. There are many phases of this confusion which I could cite. Let me point out the most obvious. You can draw upon your own experiences to supply the details of the picture. The figures I quote may be found in *Bulletin* VI of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education already referred to. In their survey contained in this bulletin Mr. Uphaus and Mr. Hipps point out the following:

1. From a study of the catalogues of *449 denominational and independent colleges and universities,* 34 were found to be giving no religious instruction whatever.
2. Of the remaining 415 institutions there were listed 468 departments in which religious instruction was being given.
3. These 468 departments were known by 90 different names.
4. There is a very great diversity of courses offered in these departments.
5. There is no standardization in the matter of giving college credit for the work done in these departments.

The types of confusion here indicated have to do with the more or less impersonal matters of organization and administration. When one faces the question of the aims and methods for the teaching of religion in the colleges, the confusion becomes little short of baffling.

Our experiment is one very modest attempt to help clarify the situation indicated. Much significant work has already been done along this line recently by students of the religious subjects. Many of the studies made, however, have been characterized by

a high degree of generality and comprehensiveness. There is, manifestly, another type of study which can be made to yield large results. A particular college can be taken as a laboratory where experiments in religious education can be carried on over a period of years and under conditions approaching scientific control. At least one such experiment has been reported. I refer to the thesis presented by Dr. E. A. Aubrey at the University of Chicago in 1926.[5] When a considerable number of such experiments have been made, it will be possible to arrive, by the inductive method, at some bases for the standardization of the teaching of religion in the colleges.

The courses in the department of religion at Bucknell University have been going through a reorganization. Two influences have been affecting this process. One influence is the desire to have all the departments conform to the "old line" offerings of many of the more conservative Eastern colleges and universities. The other influence is the desire to build a free and diversified curriculum based largely upon the vital experiences of the students involved. The present organization of the curriculum is a compromise between these two influences. There are four groups of courses offered:

I. Biblical Literature.
II. History of Religions and Psychology of Religion.
III. Christian Social Ethics.
IV. Religious Education (Technique).

The names of these four groups of courses indicate fairly well the principle upon which this curriculum has been formulated. The principle may be definitely stated in four propositions, as follows:

1. Students living in the midst of a professedly Christian culture should have the opportunity of studying the sacred literature of that culture.
2. Students should have the opportunity of studying the religious development and of appreciating the spiritual heritage of non-Christian as well as Christian peoples.
3. Inasmuch as Christianity involves the task of living constructively in our modern times, students should have the opportunity of studying inductively the social

ethics of the modern American life in the light of the ethical teachings of the Founder and all those social prophets, ancient and modern, who have helped to make the Christian ethic.

4. Since many of these students will be called upon to become the teachers and leaders in church and community religious activities, they should have the opportunity of learning how to teach religion and to direct its educational processes.

Without going into too much detail, I would like to point out certain lines of correlation which we are working out at Bucknell. The head of the department of religion took the initiative and announced in the catalogue a list of eight courses in other departments, any two of which would be counted toward the satisfaction of a major group, and any one of which would count toward the satisfaction of a minor group in religion. This has met with some response from the other departments. Five other departments now count courses in religion as applicable towards the satisfaction of major groups in those particular departments. Our course in the Literature of the Bible is credited and announced in the department of English literature as well as in the department of religion. Our courses in Christian Social Ethics are credited in the department of sociology. One course, Christianity and Business, is credited in the four-year degree course, B.S. in Commerce and Finance. As many as three courses in religion may be credited toward the four-year degree course, B.S. in Education, and it is so announced in the official literature. Our course in Psychology of Religion has been credited in the department of philosophy. Philosophy of Religion is given in the department of philosophy as a one-hour course, a poor arrangement at best and due for a readjustment. One lamentable failure to correlate philosophy and religion is seen in the fact that our History of Religions course in the department of religion is not made a prerequisite to the one-hour Philosophy of Religion course given in the department of philosophy. One of the significant correlations yet to be achieved is that with the department of history, but we are not without hope that this may be done.

The educational theory underlying this correlation of departments I tried to state in the Federal Council *Bulletin* for May, 1928.[6] In that article I pointed out that, in spite of the fact that many students desire to be better informed in the field of religion, yet comparatively few are going to major or minor in the religious subjects. They must prepare to teach public school, to practice law, or medicine, or journalism, etc. Following such lines, their major and minor groups are pretty well chosen for them. Consequently many students who wish to study the religious subjects find that they are prevented by the requirements of their major courses. Why should it not be possible for a student, preparing for one of the professions indicated above, to get an introduction to the religious subjects at the same time and in the very same courses by which he satisfies his major course requirements? This is manifestly easier in some departments than in others. It would be very difficult to make such arrangements for pre-medic or pre-engineering students, for instance. On the other hand it would be quite easy in connection with other departments. To be specific, let us take history. A student majoring in history, let us say, has the privilege of electing a course in the history of some one or several of the countries in the Fertile Crescent. Rather than put the emphasis upon Egypt or Babylon, why not put it upon the religious development of the Hebrew people. Certainly the latter emphasis would be of far greater value in helping that student to understand his Christian heritage. On the other hand, what finer introduction to Fertile Crescent history could one desire than a study of the Hebrew development in its relations to the development of other civilization? Now if such student were free to elect the course in Hebrew Civilization and still have the work credited toward his major requirements in history, even though the work were done in the department of religion, a correlation of those two departments could be said to have been begun, at least. The History of Christianity offers a parallel case. By taking thought similar correlations could be made with practically all of the other departments in the liberal arts college.

The details of correlation go deeper than these administrative matters, but I cannot take time to bring them out here.

The second major emphasis of this paper is in the field of methodology. I have been trying to find out what can be done to develop a life-centered curriculum in college, and just how the biblical literature can be of most help. This experiment has now been in progress four years in certain courses in the department of religion. The work of one course in particular will be of interest to this group. It is announced under the title "The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus," and is placed in the Christian Social Ethics group.

Quite definitely I have been following Dr. W. C. Bower's method as developed in his book, *The Curriculum of Religious Education.*(7) My problem came to be, How can an experience-centered method be used in a course which professes to be a study of biblical literature?

The teacher takes each class into his confidence at the very beginning of the semester's work. Everybody understands that we are experimenting and everybody is encouraged to take as critical an attitude toward the method and its results as possible. The procedure involves, first of all, an analysis of the social functions of a typical community. These functions are seen to be operating in certain definite areas of social experience. Out of these areas of social experience have come social customs and social institutions which must be dealt with. The areas of experience are then arranged in some logical or chronological order. Always, the area of the family experience is seen to be fundamental from almost any point of view. We therefore dig into a study of the social areas of family experience. This involves more analysis to determine just what are the problem situations in that area of experience. Having determined these conflict centers or crises, each student elects to study one and agrees to keep the class informed of the progress and the results of his study. The procedure itself is one of socialization. Each student, in his special study, proceeds by the steps of the experience method already outlined.

In such a method, how does the biblical material come in? Is it not arbitrarily dragged in without very much consideration

for the implications of the method itself? Let me attempt to answer the second question first. Our experiment convinces us that the biblical literature has a very real place in such a method. The student expects, of course, to study the literature because he has signed up for a course in the Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus. The main difference lies in our approach to that literature and our use of it. We are not interested merely in making a survey of these teachings. A thorough survey may come later, and if it does it will have real meaning. We are interested in living constructively in the midst of our very complex American life. As we make our analyses and think through to the possible ways out, what does the recorded experience of Jesus and his fellow-prophets have to offer us which may help to enrich and control our present experience? The classes have repeatedly come to the conclusion that not every social teaching in the Bible is applicable to our modern life. But they see that there is much that does have direct and constructive bearing upon the problems differentiated by our analyses. For instance, students are not able to accept the absolute position with reference to divorce, but they do come to a new understanding of the significance of marriage.

But is not such a method of using the biblical literature just an extension of the rejected proof-text method? It is quite possible that our method might degenerate into the proof-text method, but such a degeneration is not inherent in the experience method itself. Two factors operate to safeguard us here. First, we make an effort to study all the biblical material relevant to the area of experience under consideration. In this way we are prevented from fastening upon any one dictum as final. On the other hand, it affords a splendid way to have students see the developmental nature of the biblical ethic with reference to the particular area of social experience under investigation.

The second factor operating as a safeguard against the development of a proof-text method is the technique for handling the biblical material when found. I can do nothing more than indicate the steps of this technique. They are:

(1) Survey the total biblical situation to discover all relevant facts.

(2) Outline the teaching to be found in this survey of the total situation. (This teaching frequently lies in the meaning of the situation rather than in any direct statement, of course.)
(3) Compare the biblical situation with the present situation to determine the similarities and differences.
(4) Indicate whether the biblical situation has or has not meaning for the present situation, and what that meaning is.

While the experience method is certainly not a fool-proof one, nevertheless we have found that the two factors just outlined do safeguard us quite well. Our point is, dealing with total biblical situations and relating them to total present situations is not a proof-text method. On the other hand, it seems to be the common sense method of dealing with historical subject matter in social ethics, whether that subject matter be ancient or modern.

The finest testimonial to the value of the experience method which has come to my attention is the fact that two of my students who are now pastors of progressive churches have reorganized their educational work and are now using successfully the method they learned to use in this particular course. Their use of the new tool is the finest praise they could give it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) *Undergraduates*—Fisher, Edwards, and Artman, Institute of Social and Religious Research, New York City.
(2) *Religion in the Colleges*—(The Princeton Conference)—Galen M. Fisher—Institute of Social and Religious Research.
(3) *Undergraduate Courses in Religion at Denominational and Independent Colleges and Universities*—*Bulletin* VI of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education—M. T. Hipps and Willard Uphaus, Ithaca, N. Y.
(4) *Undergraduate Instruction in Religion*—Report of a Seminar conducted by Professor G. A. Coe, Teachers College, New York.
(5) *An Experiment in College Religion Education*—E. A. Aubrey—University of Chicago (1926).
(6) *How to Teach Religion to College Students*—C. M. Bond—Federal Council *Bulletin*, May, 1928, New York.
(7) *The Curriculum of Religious Education*—W. C. Bower. Scribner's, New York (1925).
(8) *Ibid.*, pp. 209–210.

THE COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF BIBLE AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION—ITS OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

Professor George H. Fickes,
Lafayette College

Our discussion has to do with the fundamental and essential worth of the primary information as it is found in the Bible whether regarded as historical or legendary. To illustrate, are not the moral and spiritual values to be derived from the story of Jonah dependent upon a knowledge of the facts relating to Jonah as given in the Bible, whether we regard the story as allegory or history?

If this is granted, the second question is—have the Sunday schools and homes from which our students come given them this primary knowledge and is the college justified in requiring that from one-third to one-half of a student's work in the department of Bible and Religious Education shall be done in Old Testament History.

The writer is convinced there is definite need for teaching the primary facts of the Old Testament in college. The same may be said with equal assurance of the New Testament.

To determine the worth of this assumption tests in Bible information have been given to representative groups or to all members of the freshman classes entering Lafayette College during the past three years. The first year the entire class took the Laycock Biblical Information Test; the next year the engineers took the same test; this year the engineers took an Old Testament Information test constructed by the writer who has had assigned to him the work in Old Testament with the engineering students. The last test was designed to cover all the outstanding characters, events, and movements of the Old Testament. The tests in all cases have revealed similar conditions.

The test was of the objective type, comprised of true-false, completion, and multiple choice questions, samples of which will appear later. The men were told not to guess but to omit questions the answers to which they felt sure they did not know.

The questions here listed have been selected because they represent the type of information dependent upon Sunday school instruction rather than upon more general knowledge gathered from sources outside of formal teaching agencies.

Sample True-false questions—

The ark built by Noah is also known as the Ark of the Covenant, correct answers were given by 52 men; wrong by 15; omitted by 10.

The 19th Psalm contains—"The heavens declare the glory of God," correct 27; wrong 14; omitted 35.

Saul was the first king of Israel—correct 33, wrong 16; omitted 27.

Completion questions—

The name of Jacob's brother was ———————— —correct 8; wrong 10; omitted 58.

A coat of many colors was worn by ———————— —correct 36; wrong 21; omitted 19.

The name of the woman who helped the Hebrew spies to escape from Jerico was ———————— —correct 0; wrong 3; omitted 73.

Multiple choice questions—(The student designates the correct name of the four by underscoring it).

David was the son of Samuel, Saul, Jesse, Jonathan— correct 21; wrong 36; omitted 19.

Ishmael was the son of Hagar, Bilhah, Rachel, Jael—correct 8; wrong 13; omitted 55.

Very significant were the answers to questions relating to the Ten Commandments. The questions given were of the completion and multiple choice types. The answers indicated knowledge of the commandments as to their order and the idea contained therein.

Correct answers were given as follows—Third commandment known by 17.23 per cent of the students; fourth commandment by 34.21 per cent; sixth by 50 per cent; seventh by 47.36 per cent; eighth by 46.05 per cent; ninth by 44.73; and the tenth by 43.42 per cent.

Seventy-six students took the test. The average number of correct answers to the 100 questions was 23.5 per student.

Each man was asked to state definitely the number of years he had attended Sunday school. The range was from two to seventeen; the average was a little over ten years per student.

It would seem that a group of college students coming from the finest of homes, as these men do, with a normal amount of Sunday school experience, could be expected to know more of the primary facts of the Bible than this test reveals. Isn't the conclusion inevitable from the results of this and other similar tests, that the modern Sunday school is not effectively getting over to its students the Bible information it professes to hold essential to their normal religious development? If this conclusion is justified, and if the materials of the Bible are fundamental to character building does it not follow that the first task of a college department is the supply of plain, primary Bible information?

The writer believes therefore that one of the objectives of a college department of Religious Education is to equip the youth with a knowledge of the materials of that part of his religious inheritance found in the Old Testament. The Bible contains the record of human experiences incident to the quest of individuals and of groups to find God, and the record of their efforts to satisfactorily relate themselves to Him in worship, and in service.

Someone will suggest that the spiritual values to be derived from the Bible are not dependent upon and are not to be evaluated by the mere knowledge of Bible facts. This is quite true but if Bible information is one of the factors in religious development, should not the securing of that knowledge be the first definite objective of religious instruction?

Another task confronting the college department of Bible and Religious Education is to help, and to guide the student in the reconstruction of his own religious experience.

The student is separated from the social influences of the home, the church, and the community that have very largely made him what he is. He finds in this new freedom other and sometimes conflicting standards which he must face and from which he must choose the ones he will follow. Too frequently the teaching of his former years has failed to give him the principles and technique by which he is enabled to face problems,

and to arrive at intelligent and wise solutions that are his own, and to which he is willing to commit himself in the face of all opposition.

Another condition of college life that challenges the religious educator is its unnaturalness. It is as true in a coeducational as in any other type of college, that students inexperienced in life are grouped together apart from the influence of children, and of mature folks.

The stabilizing power of children in the home and in the community is of greater value than any youth realizes. Even more may be affirmed of the contacts of youth with adults. Unbalanced thinking and acting usually take place when groups of young people are removed from the restraints and constraints of childhood and adulthood, that is when they are removed from the normal family relationships. The Creator wisely grouped folks in families where all ages from the babe to the grey-haired grandparent mingle and live together in mutual helpfulness.

Another salient condition attaches to modern college life because of the intensity with which it is lived. Each instructor feels the necessity of crowding all the learning possible into his course each day. He is conscious of the flight of time and the student is hurried from one phase of the subject to another without time to learn maturely any one of them. If he has any leisure time at his disposal, he is confronted with a great variety of extra-curricular interests and activities sufficient to occupy all his time exclusive of study.

The college years represent the period when the religion of adulthood is largely determined. The average age of the men of the freshman class this year is a little above eighteen years. Professor Pratt, of Williams College, writing of the period of adolescence, calls it, "the flowering time for religion"; he adds, "the transition from childhood to adolescence is the most momentous change in the whole life of the individual. No other period is so fateful in its influence upon the entire life."

We call attention to this condition in order to point out that the student needs a course or courses that provide materials and guidance by which he may be enabled to think through some of

the religious problems which must be dealt with in this period of his life if he is to have a religion of his own.

In view of and as a result of the above, the modern college campus develops inevitably a psychological condition conducive to most definite, far-reaching, and satisfactory religious development.

There is no field of learning to-day so challenging, so baffling, and yet so rewarding to the scientific student of the ways and means of religious development as that offered in the field of Religious Education among college students. It merits the devotion of the greatest minds of our day. To this end Lafayette offers courses in Comparative Religions, Psychology of Religion, and Philosophy of Religion.

A third objective of the department of Bible and Religious Education is the contribution to the training of the lay leadership of the church. The courses in this line must be elective, of course, but there is a group of students in every class and in every institution upon whom will depend the lay leadership of the church of the future. From fifteen to thirty men each term elect to study the Principles of Religious Education or the Principles of Religious Development. These courses have as their definite goal the development of an understanding of the objectives of Religious Education and of the methods by which they are to be achieved in the church school, home, and college. These courses have never failed to elicit a most wholesome interest on the part of men who are likely to become lay leaders in the churches to which they belong.

A more definite aim at leadership training, both avocational, and vocational, is attempted in a seminar for men who are or will be engaged in church leadership. This group is carefully chosen and gives itself to the study of the Program and Problems of Religious Education as they relate to the local church.

The primary problem of the Department of Bible and Religious Education is to meet modern needs of present day youth in a modern and scientific way. Its aim and method must be student centered, *i.e.*, the needs of the student must be the conditioning factor governing the selection of curriculum materials and the method of their presentation.

The personnel of the department must be chosen on the basis of knowledge of the materials to be taught but also with regard to a psychological knowledge of the students as they are found in the classroom. The teacher of religion should be a master of the technique of teaching. It is comparatively easy to teach science so as to develop a scientist, it is most difficult to teach religion so that a man shall surely become an exponent of the Christian way of living.

CONFERENCE ON FINANCIAL AND FIDUCIARY MATTERS, 1929

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

The third biennial Conference on Financial and Fiduciary Matters, under the auspices of the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters of the Federal Council of the Churches, was held at the Hotel Chalfonte, Atlantic City, March 19–21, 1929. The attendance was about one hundred, practically the same as at former conferences. A little more than one quarter of those present represented church boards, home and foreign missions chiefly; just slightly less in number were those who represented colleges and universities—presidents and treasurers; the rest represented social philanthropies, hospitals, Bible and tract societies, some banks and trust companies and specialists in finance, and the Christian Associations both of Young Men and of Young Women.

The subjects dealt with in the program and discussions were somewhat more psychological and interpretative in character than in former years, in an effort to understand the motives which prompt people to benevolence as revealed in charities founded and gifts recently made, and the trends which are becoming manifest in the promotion of human welfare and the support of philanthropies. Several specialists who had analyzed charitable foundations set up within the last twenty-five years, the charitable giving of a typical American city since the beginning of the century, and the receipts of the mission boards of the

church during the same period brought valuable and suggestive data. In a similar way attention was given to the movements in the stock markets and in the financial conditions of the world, under the guidance of qualified speakers, with a view to discovering principles which would safeguard the investment of charitable funds.

The Conference voted to have the papers which were presented published in book form as in previous years.

The Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters was requested to consider the advisability of publishing a handbook of organizations, such as were represented in the conference, giving legal names and other important information for the use of lawyers and others who are concerned with the making of wills and the support of charities.

All charitable organizations were urged to make the reports, which are given to the public, accurate and informing.

A conservative estimate of the amount of endowments and trust funds represented in the Conference was made as follows:

Funds producing income for the four classes of charities (1) religious organizations, (2) educational institutions, (3) health movements and (4) social welfare	$1,300,000.00
Funds embodied in educational plants and equipment	1,000,000.00
Funds now held by Foundations, approximately	1,000,000.00

Fair inferences to be drawn from well-considered statements made at the Conference would include the following:

1. Large giving, expressing itself in the present century, tends less to benefit distinctively religious objects, when compared with former centuries, and more to benefit health and physical conditions, and education. This may indicate a broader recognition of religious values in all that pertains to human welfare. Certainly the desire to improve the conditions of this present life seem as compelling as formerly was the wish to avoid the ills of a future life.

2. The motive prevalent in the minds of benevolent people, as stated in their words and shown by their acts, tends more and more to be due in some form to a sense of social obligation.

3. The real proprietors of various charities are not the secretaries, the treasurers, the boards and other officials, who manage them, but the people who give the money for their support. The officials are simply the agents of those who contribute the funds. Large givers in recent years are inclined to call the agents to an accounting and are making it plain that, unless the agents can give a good account of their stewardship, they may no longer be entrusted with the task. Large giving has a very marked tendency to give, not always to existing organizations, but to organizations specially created to study existing organizations, to look for overlooked needs and investigate poorly performed tasks and antiquated methods.

4. Confidence was expressed in posthumous discretion. No man now living knows enough, or can look forward far enough, to justify his imposing conditions upon his gifts which shall reach far beyond his death. A modifying discretion should be attached to every long-term benefaction, so that at some future time the living judgment of that time may adapt former good intentions to the then existing conditions. Ancient good may become uncouth, and worse.

Any inquiries respecting the Conference, the subjects discussed and the publications may be addressed to the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters, 105 East 22nd St., New York, N. Y.

The two previous conferences held in this place have enrolled about 100 attendants each time. At a time when 58 persons were enrolled, I made an analysis which showed the following percentage, which will indicate approximately the diversified character of the conference as we sit together here in session: representatives of church boards, 27 per cent; of colleges, 24 per cent; specialists (meaning experts in accountancy, in actuarial service or philanthropy), 14 per cent; social workers, 12 per cent; trust companies, banks and brokers, 7 per cent; tract, Bible and Sunday school societies, 7 per cent; the Y. W. C. A., 5 per cent; Y. M. C. A., 4 per cent. You will understand that in the final enrolment these percentages will be altered, but this shows approximately what a cross-section of financial-charitable interests we are.

The Chairman of this Conference has control over its proceedings. Each speaker is supposed to take for the presentation of his subject, fifteen to twenty minutes, not more than twenty minutes, out of at least a full hour assigned to the subject. Discussion then will be permitted, each speaker being limited to three minutes, unless he proves to have something particularly worth while saying, when the Chairman has authority to extend his time reasonably.

This Conference has no power over itself or over anybody else. The opinions expressed here have no binding force. If they are printed, it depends upon the wish of the Conference with the manifest prospect of sufficient sales to cover costs when printed. Printing will confer upon opinions here expressed no authority; they will have only the weight of their intrinsic worth. By our action here we can bind no other body, least of all the Federal Council, although we are a committee of the Federal Council. Let me say at this juncture that, although we are a committee of the Federal Council we do not represent simply the constituency of that Council, for at least one important Catholic institution is represented by a delegate to this Conference. We have served and are ready to serve Catholic and Jewish charities as well as any others.

The Chairman of this Committee gives all of the time and strength which he reasonably can to the work of the Committee and carries on an extensive correspondence. During the last year more than 200,000 copies of printed literature have been issued and distributed by the Committee. There is an awakening interest in the things we are doing shown in all parts of the country. The correspondence is varied in kind and importance. The printed matter is paid for in three ways: first, by sales which are made of the booklets which, if sold pretty nearly out, leave a small balance of profit; second, by the gifts of chiefly one person who is much interested in the work we are doing; and, third, by balances left over from the enrolment fees collected at conferences. A modest appropriation from the Federal Council covers our office rent and part-time services of a secretary.

WHAT PRECEDES THIS CONFERENCE?*

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

Nearly ten years ago a conference of treasurers and financial secretaries of home mission boards was called by the then secretary of the Home Missions Council. The reason for calling the conference was that that secretary thought some methods of handling funds were somewhat out of date, and that positive advantages could be secured from cooperation. Others beside home mission officials learned of the conference and desired to attend. About seventy-five people assembled, and deemed it well worth while. A second conference followed in a year, or a little more. Both of these conferences were informal but each stirred the waters of minds previously flowing somewhat placidly.

At this time the Home Missions Council appointed a Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters, which hardly knew what to do or whither it was going. This Committee took itself one day to the Federal Council and asked the Federal Council if it was willing to adopt such a child and give it freedom to play in the dooryard, shaping its own program, irresponsible for the finances of the Federal Council, offering to learn and to be of service in all fields of charitable endeavor. The Committee was adopted. This gave it a household connection and a home.

Since this adoption, which took place five years ago, the Committee has held six conferences, three large ones, one of which was in February, 1925, the second in March, 1927, and this, the third, is held in March, 1929. From the two preceding conferences two books have appeared containing the papers presented and these have circulated to the extent of more than 700 copies each.

Two rather significant conferences have been held in New York City relating exclusively to annuity agreements or conditional gifts. One local conference has been held in New York City as a kind of experiment. The two conferences on annuities

* An explanatory paper read at the opening of the Third Conference on Financial and Fiduciary Matters held at Atlantic City, N. J., March 19–21, 1929. This is published here because of general interest in its statements.

have published booklets and these are circulating to such an extent as to give promise eventually of closing out an edition of a thousand copies of each report. It is a matter of some surprise and chagrin that persons who attend the conferences seek at times to drive pretty sharp bargains. If they expect to attend but a few of the sessions they wish to have a discount on the enrolment fee. Quite a number of them, in a canny Scotch way, write that they will not enroll until later because they do not wish to pay the enrolment fee unless they are actually coming. It is a small way to finance the Committee to ask the boards which have the benefit of the Committee's activities year by year, and throughout the years, to make a contribution of five dollars apiece for those who may attend the Conference. If some of the boards felt like sending a contribution irrespective of whether a delegate came or not, it would be an act of generosity which would be greatly appreciated.

I know not what the future of this Conference or of this Committee may be. Its life depends now so largely upon the voluntary services of a single individual. It would seem as though a valuable kind of service had been started. Somebody must take care of it if it is to continue into the future. Two years ago one of the votes of the Conference recommended that a secretary be secured for the Committee and a budget of at least $15,000 be raised. That budget has not materialized. There is the feeling in the minds of some that as long as a free horse is willing to carry a load it is best to let him carry it. Some possibly think that the free horse takes himself too seriously. Others may optimistically expect that some good manna out of heaven will fall to support those who engage in such worthy undertakings. I utter these words simply as a warning, if what is now in progress has real value, somebody must give it more thoughtful consideration than anyone as yet has done, a consideration I think which should not express itself here in this Conference so much as in the meetings of the boards or amongst influential people who in other places will plan and shape a continuing program and policy.

BISHOP BRENT

O. D. FOSTER

With steady feet planted squarely upon the solid earth of every day human interests, our fallen leader has long stood with his cool head in the clouds of idealism, with his clear eyes fixed upon the Elysian Fields of better things, with his warm heart aglow for all mankind—regardless of race or creed—and with his saintly spirit constantly in tune with the Infinite. Most truly, a mighty man of God was our dearly beloved and highly revered Bishop Charles H. Brent.

How fitting that he should be taken at the very spot, in Lausanne, where, two years ago, he made his last great stand to bring into more harmonious relations, all the branches of the Christian Church on earth. He fell on what was his last and perhaps greatest battlefield; where in all probability he felt nearest heaven.

Bishop Brent incarnated, what so many talk about—the spirit of unity. He lived it. Among his dearest friends and most ardent admirers are Catholics, Jews, Protestants and others not of these folds. While an Episcopalian in church membership, he belonged to us all. Though we shall long mourn his loss we shall always thank God that we have been blessed by his comradeship, counsel and guidance. We shall constantly cherish his sacred memory in tender, affectionate and reverential regard. Our loss seems irreparable.

Bishop Brent was a giant in any sphere he entered. Since we cannot deal here in biographical details, suffice it to say that in the University Department of the Council, he served as the prophet of a new day, the statesman of a new order. He gave of his precious time and failing strength to the advancement of the ideals of the American Association on Religion, of which he was the president. This was thoroughly natural for him, as his heart embraced, in our great universities, not only the boys and girls of Protestant families but also those from Catholic and Jewish homes as well.

He was one of the world's few souls, who felt the sting of defeat for the shortcomings of one from another group, quite as keenly as for one of his own.

The injection of his spirit into the universities of this country not only dignified religion by compelling respect but also made possible the inauguration of comprehensive and constructive programs, which otherwise would have been impossible. A new day was dawning because of his immeasurable influence.

Who will carry on what he so auspiciously began? Where shall we find another such leader? Perhaps no such is to appear, but that it is left to the many to take up the torch and to carry it into the remaining dark areas of human bigotry and selfishness.

We do not see, in his departure, upon whom his priceless mantle will fall, yet may we earnestly pray for the precious heritage of a double portion of his spirit in the advancement of our common Father's Kingdom.

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

Character Building in Colleges, W. A. Harper, The Abingdon Press, New York, $1.50.

President Harper is a glutton for facts. He is not only a good scout in assembling facts, but he knows how to masticate, digest and assimilate them. This book, therefore, is based upon a foundation of knowledge of what is going on in the colleges, which is unusual in works of this sort.

Dr. Harper's success in assimilating facts is due to his wisdom which is the outgrowth of twenty-five years of experience in this field. Dr. Harper's equipment of knowledge and wisdom has enabled him to produce a volume which is informing and stimulating. No specialist in this field can afford to ignore this book. It should be in all the libraries.—*R. L. K.*

Undergraduate Instruction in Religious Education in the United States, Monograph No. 2. By a Group of Graduate Students. The Religious Education Association, Chicago, 1927.

The study of undergraduate instruction in religious education in the United States, a project of one of Dr. Coe's graduate classes doing "field work through the medium of print" is rich

in information and ideas, and is an invaluable contribution to the literature of religious education.

In this study the term religious education is narrowly interpreted as "the theory and practice of teaching religion." The following questions are raised:

(1) How extensive is undergraduate instruction in Religious Education in the United States?

(2) How are courses in Religious Education related to other courses in the curriculum?

(3) To what extent does this instruction represent professional training?

(4) What kind of instruction is being given in Religious Education?

(5) To what extent are the teachers of these courses specially trained in Religious Education?

(6) What books are being used as texts and references? To what extent are these books adequate?

In the year 1925–6 courses in Religious Education were taught in 172 institutions in thirty-six states. Six hundred fifty-seven courses representing 1811 semester hours enrolled 10,389 students. The average institution gave 2.8 courses, 6.5 semester hours, with an average enrolment of thirteen students per course. Thirty per cent of the 172 institutions offered only one course in Religious Education, fifty-six per cent offered one or two, forty-two per cent offered less than five semester hours per year, twenty per cent had less than eight students enrolled per course.

Expansion in the pre-war period reached its peak in 1915 with six institutions reporting the introduction of new courses. In the post-war period the year 1925 is the year of most rapid expansion with twenty-six institutions reporting new courses in Religious Education.

The study reveals the encouraging fact that "so far as academic training is concerned, the teacher of religious education in undergraduate institutions appears in a remarkably favorable light. Although comparative figures are not at hand, it is to be doubted whether the instructors in any other field of collegiate study would average as many years of graduate work."

In a chapter on "The Contemporary Academic Setting" the study deals with the major educational problems of the college in a clear and forceful way. College aims, administration, faculty, curriculum, selection of students, intellectual attitudes, R. O. T. C., athletics, social life, politics, student government, and the religious life of students are all brought into focus for examination. Unfortunately there seems to be some lack of connection between the early chapters and this later one. This is doubtless due to the fact that the work was done by committees each working somewhat independently. Ample justification is given in the early chapters for confining the study to "the theory and practice of teaching religion," simply because the task of surveying the whole field of the study of religion seemed too enormous a task. But in view of the fact that "religious education" is thus narrowly conceived, too heavy a burden is placed upon the two or three courses enrolling on the average thirteen students per course in each institution, confined to the rather narrow and technical task of learning how to teach religion.

Two alternatives are offered the teacher of religious education, viz: (a) Merely training his students to succeed on the present level of insight, with religious standards and values accepted as finished and matured; or (b) making his classes forums for the discussion and definition of the vital perplexities of our time. The latter alternative of course is the ideal one, but if chosen would seem to demand both in subject matter and method something akin to courses, in ethics, sociology, social psychology and the historical, psychological and sociological study of religion. In other words in spite of the narrow interpretation of the term "religious education" adopted in the early part of the study, this narrow interpretation breaks down as the real task of religious education is seen in relation to the areas of human experience in which a student lives and works out his values. Indeed the study frankly recognizes this difficulty and admits: "No one portion of the college community by itself can solve all, or perhaps any one, of the many puzzles with which this community is faced," but sums up the matter with a dominant optimism and a challenge to religious education to try in spite of the dif-

ficulties. "But surely a department whose subject matter deals so largely with the learning of cooperation by different groups of people, whose method calls for constant experimentation to meet new and untried situations, and whose teachers are fellow learners with their students, may be expected to contribute a technique for drawing people together in a search for solutions and an openminded testing of promising possibilities."—*H. L. S.*

HERE AND THERE

A college education speeds the young man on his way to the ministry rather than keeping him back from his life work, according to recently compiled statistics in the *Methodist Year Book*. The college graduate enters the ministry at an age nine years younger than the man who has not passed beyond the eighth grade, the figures show. Four hundred and fifty-nine men entered the Methodist Episcopal conferences in 1927, and the statistics are based on reports from 98 per cent of these, or 450.

Two hundred and ninety-four, or about sixty-five per cent of the men had a full or partial college course. About half of the 450 had a complete or partial seminary training. Of those who went to college, 172 attended Methodist institutions, 35 went to colleges of other denominations and 87 attended independent or other types of schools. Of those who attended theological schools, 196 enrolled in Methodist institutions and 30 attended other schools. Somewhat less than ten per cent of the men entering the conferences in 1927 never entered high school. The figures below give the general education of the new ministers and the ages of the different groups when admitted:

General Education of Entrants		Average Age when Admitted
Eighth grade or less	41 or 9.1%	37.5
High School incomplete	65 or 14.4%	36.8
High School complete	50 or 11.1%	33.7
College incomplete	80 or 17.8%	31.1
College complete	214 or 47.6%	28.7

The appointment of Dr. Henry H. Meyer to the deanship of the School of Religious Education and Social Service of Boston University, together with a change of the school's program, making it a senior college and a graduate school, has been announced by the university trustees through President Daniel L. Marsh. Dr. Meyer is chairman of the Commission on Education of the Near East Relief and Secretary of the Curriculum Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

* * * * *

Six fellowships for men and women amounting to $1,200 each for graduate study in the United States or abroad will be awarded by the Rector Scholarship Foundation of DePauw University, beginning next June. The fellowships will be available to DePauw graduates "who have shown scholarship ability, ability for doing creative work, and who show the best possible chances for success in their chosen fields." These are the first fellowships offered by DePauw University to its own graduates for continuing post-graduate studies. The Rector Fellowships, which are to be clear gifts, and may be used anywhere, were announced on Mrs. Edward Rector's birthday and on the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Rector Scholarship Foundation, which paid the tuition and fees this year of 540 Rector men on the DePauw campus.

* * * * *

Professor Henry E. Garrett has studied the differences between 296 representative freshmen at Columbia, and finds that the Jewish students are far superior both in intelligence test scores and in classroom grades. Students of Italian ancestry do better work than would be expected from their intelligence ratings, whereas with the Irish students just the reverse is the case.

"Classified as to religion, the Hebrew students rank higher than the Catholics and Protestants," Professor Garrett reported. "There were no significant differences between Catholics and Protestants."

Native ability may be the cause of the superiority of the Hebrew students, but apart from this there are two other possible contributing causes:

"In the first place, it is very probable that the preparation of those Jews who apply for admission to Columbia College is on the whole better than that of the other applicants. Secondly, the standards or criteria for admission are probably somewhat higher for Jewish students."

* * * * *

A recent issue of the *Literary Digest* devoted two pages to an account of the triumphal journey in 1928 of the Bates College debating team around the world. During this tour this team composed of Messrs. Ames, Guptill and Davis traveled more than 35,000 miles and spoke in public some fifty times apiece. Their debates were held in the United States, Honolulu, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and England. Of these forensic contests there was no decision in ten, in ten others Bates won the approval of the audiences or judges, as the case might be, and in three the decision was given to the opposing team.

There are numerous newspaper clippings indicating the high appreciation in which these debates were held in the various countries concerned. There is a general consensus of opinion that international debating is a good means of developing international goodwill.

* * * * *

The Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th Street, New York City, following the suggestion given at Rio de Janeiro in December, 1928, by President Hoover that "another form of exchange where mutual interests rise to the highest aspects, is the exchange of scientific ideas, experience in government, intellectual thought and culture," announces the Brazil Summer School to be held at Rio de Janeiro during the summer, 1929.

The plan is for all of the American members of this school to leave New York on June 29, on the steamship "Southern Cross," Munson Line, returning to New York on August 27.

Among the instructors in the summer school are a former Brazilian Secretary of State and a prominent historian, a former Director of Brazilian Public Education, a former Inspector of the Northeastern Reclamation Service and Professors in the University of Rio de Janeiro and the Collegio Pedro II.

The Chicago Theological Seminary

(Founded in 1855)

A graduate school for the training of leaders in all branches of Christian service. Affiliated with the University of Chicago. Courses open to men and women.

Full catalog furnished on request.

OZORA S. DAVIS, President

FRANK G. WARD, Dean

5757 University Avenue, Chicago

The Effective College

A book of 300 pages, setting forth the most approved ideals and procedure regarding curricula, faculty-student relations, effective teaching, promotion of scholarship, the place of religion and the fine arts in education, and the problems of finance. "For thoughtful persons who are weary of the college as a degree-mill and earnestly desire the reassertion of the intellectual character of college education." Price, $2.00 per copy. Published by the Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Ave., New York.

The Westminster Teachers' Bureau

Secures suitable teachers, officers and helpers for schools, colleges and universities—private, public and denominational—and assists trained, capable, teachers and other workers to suitable fields of service. THE WESTMINSTER SERVICE BUREAU (under same management) secures for institutions secretaries, librarians, business managers, dietitians, financial secretaries and other helpers.. We now have enrolled many capable, thoroughly prepared and experienced workers. Service is free to institutions and at three-fifths the usual charge to teachers and workers.

HENRY H. SWEETS, Manager

410 Urban Building, Louisville, Ky.